DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 377 HE 017 183

AUTHOR Watts, W. David; Forbes, Douglas
TITLE General Education Reform: A Faculty and Student View.
PUB DATE 23 Mar 84
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Social Science Association (62nd, Fort Worth, TX, March 23, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; College Administration; College Curriculum; College Programs; Conflict Resolution; *Curriculum Development; *Decision Making; *Educational Objectives; *General Education; Higher Education; Liberal Arts; Program Administration; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Southwest Texas State University

ABSTRACT

Faculty and student opinions about general education at Southwest Texas State University were assessed, along with the effect of the matrix administration structure. Views concerning the present requirements and structure of general education were surveyed, based on administration of faculty and student questionnaires. The survey data revealed that the main areas of conflict were between the technical, vocational areas and the traditional liberal arts and sciences. The liberal arts representatives felt threatened by the loss of majors and enrollment, and the representatives of the technical fields of study felt that they were not receiving the kind of support they needed. A matrix model of administration facilitates communication across different organizational structures of the university and leaves authority for decision-making at the top. In determining action, upper administration of each department must consider: commitment to general education, the strength of its major, its mission, and its external environment (e.g., the state, employers). Review of survey data and the matrix administration structure suggest that general education will play a limited role, subordinate to the major. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED243377

# GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM:

# A FACULTY AND STUDENT VIEW

W. DAVID WATTS

DOUGLAS FORBES

Presented to the Southwest Social Science Association
March 23, 1984

Department of Sociology, Anthropology,
and Social Work
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

HE 017 183

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. David Watts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

(Please do not cite without permission of the authors)

GENERAL EDUCATION AND THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM

Like other social phenomena, what is thought to be the ideal university education has undergone change. The classical model, where undergraduates were trained in the trivium, is rare if non-existent in today's university. In the face of nineteenth century demands for greater practicality, applicability, and freedom of choice, a required curriculum almost disappeared in many universities. Columbia University's core curriculum, established in the 1920s, symbolizes general education reform earlier in this century. By the 1950s, there was, by today's standards, an impressive uniformity to the structure of the university curriculum. Undergraduates faced a distribution requirement in the liberal arts and sciences, as well as major and minor requirements. In the sixties, objections to the required curriculum were expressed primarily by students.

In terms of their significance to American higher education, the curriculum changes of the 1960s may be compared with those of the land grant college period in the 1870s, according to Clark Kerr (1982). The changes produced an intensification of the emphasis on technology and science, an increase in undergraduate specialization, and minority access to higher education. Other reforms were not so successful, for example, the residential experimental college. Students by definition are inconstant, while faculty never supported many of the proposed reforms. Some of the reforms were quite popular and fit well with the existing structure of the university. These were the reforms that were popular with many faculty and tended to have much greater staying power. "These consisted of the fundamental shift from liberal to vocational studies... (Kerr, 1982: 28)." Levine (1978) points out

that the major has grown at the expense of liberal education. Gaff (1983: 27) indicates that in recent years "professional education programs have mushroomed like rain," while the traditional arts and sciences have withered. In effect, student demands for curricular reform in the 1960s helped to create curricular change which appears to be career relevant but which is significantly lacking in other important educational dimensions.

The Carnegie Council on Higher Education recently has published a series of studies examining the relationship between the major and general education. The Council observes that 58 percent of undergraduate majors are in the professions (Carnegie Council,1980: 132). Not suprisingly, diversity in the curriculum is its most marked characteristic. Diversity is also the curriculum's greatest weakness, since it means that there are few common elements that make up students' education across the country or within an institution. The expansion of majors is one of the prime elements of excessive diversity in the university curriculum. The Council notes three weaknesses associated with the major in today's curriculum: 1) they take up too much of the student's time, including electives; 2) they are too narrow and specialized; and 3) they lead to the neglect of service courses. The Council recommends that universities limit the number of hours within the major, encourage departments to develop non-major courses, and assure that some knowledge experiences are common to all students.

The Carnegie Council notes that general education is an idea in distress and calls for its re-establishment to the core of American higher education. The Council defines general education as advanced skills for continued learning, a distribution requirement, and an

effort at integration of knowledge. Gaff (1981, 1983), Chambers (1981), Hansen (1982), Hall (1983), and many others have developed models for general education. Briefly summarized, models produced in the present movement for general education reform include advanced learning skills, a distribution requirement of some type, and some form of synthesis experience, most often in the senior year. The present reform movement may provide balance to the proliferation of the major.

While the support for general education is often centered on the idea that students today are under-educated for citizenship and living, there is increasing concern that technical and vocational education may not be adequate for adaptability and advancement in employment. Beck (1981), for example, has found that liberal arts majors are more mobile within the Bell management system than technically trained employees. Watts and Johnson (1984) found that employers seek technically skilled individuals who are also broadly educated. With the rapid and massive technological and economic shifts that are occuring today (Toffler, 1982), individuals can expect to change occupations a number of times in the course of their lifetimes. The "hot" occupational field today may be the occupational dinosaur of tommorow.

## GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM: LEADERSHIP AND PROBLEMS

Leadership for the present era of curricular reform has come from a number of sources in addition to the Carnegie Council. The General Education Models Project, sponsored by the Society for the Study of Values in Higher Education, was a three year project undertaken by a consortium of universities. The GEM Project has prepared a number of publications as well as leading curricular refrom on its participating institution campuses. Dr. Jerry Gaff, the executive director of

Project GEM, has published a number of articles and books on general education. Arthur Levine, a sociologist with extensive research experience for the Carnegie Commission and Council, and Ernest Boyer, previous Chancellor of the State University of New York system, are all active and articulate spokespersons for general education reform. The American College Testing Project (ACT) is sponsoring a series of conferences across the country reviewing general education.

Reform movments identify problems that need to be changed. The leaders of the general education reform movement have identified the academic department and the faculty as problems that must be addressed. Chambers (1981; 48) writes that, "The triumph of the academic department as an autonomous unit capable of demanding greater loyalty than the institution of which it is a part is certainly the primary cause of the splintering of the academic curriculum..." Chambers goes on to argue that the academic community is really more akin to sets of fiefs, dedicated far more to the preservation of each unit than the institutional whole. Susan Wittig, chair of GEM's advisory board and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Southwest Texas State University, has commented that academic departments have become transformed from the "Administrative conveniences they were meant to be into `naturally ordained divisions of knowledge (quoted in Chambers, 1981: 23).'" Like the departments they spend their professional lives in, faculty are seen as resistant to general education, since it takes them away from research and teaching within their own disciplines.

STUDENTS AND GENERAL EDUCATION

In the sixties, students protested civil rights, American involvement in Viet Nam, and internal university policies that were

seen as restrictive. The university curriculum was one area that was affected. Students were successful in achieving change in their curriculum requirements; fewer generally required courses were imposed on students. Relevance in the academic curriculum was the order of the day. The problem, of course, with relevance is that it is relative to definition and situation. In some universities and programs, students were permitted to define relevance by selecting their own courses. In others, as the number of hours for university requirements diminshed, some degree or major areas increased their requirements, demanding a greater proportion of the student's academic time. Often professional accrediting bodies implicitly or explicitly strengthened technical and vocational programs' demands for more hours.

Unlike the 1960s, students are not vocal advocates for curriculum reform. Students often express dissatisfaction with courses outside their majors, but as Levine (1978: 23) reports, 97 percent of students want a "well-rounded general education." The same proportion of students in 1969 and 1976 prefer a broad education. Gaff and Davis (1981) surveyed students in the ten institutions participating in Project GEM. Of 1,698 responses, they found that only 20 percent were very satisfied with their general education courses, while 59 percent were moderately satisfied, and 18 percent were not very satisfied. On the other hand, over 50 percent said that a broad general education was important to them, and 44 percent said that it was moderately important. Students were also asked to select preferences for general education: 83 percent preferred distribution requirements; 74 percent wanted courses integrated with each other; and 62 percent wanted courses tailored to their different majors. While students are not

opposed to general education reform, they are not vocally demanding reforms as they did in the 1960s.

ADMINISTRATIVE MODELS AND GENERAL EDUCATION

While this paper examines faculty and student opinion regarding general education at one university, administration can hardly be ignored. The following organizational model provides a conceptual framework. The model is schematically displayed in Figure 1. Four

(FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE)

basic types of university organizations are presented: faculty democracy, organizational unit democracy, hierarchical administration, and matrix administration. Each represents a variation in the extent to which faculty and administration exercise control over and participate in the construction of a university's general education curriculum. In a faculty democracy, faculty vote, either in a mass meeting or by referendum, on a number of possibilities for curriculum structure. The administration's role would be limited to facilitation and implementation of the final faculty decision. With regard to curriculum, many universities give the faculty a fairly free hand. The second option, organizational unit democracy, permits faculty involvement and democratic selection of alternatives but within the department, school, or college. The administration receives the recommendations from each group, assesses competing perspectives, and decides what to do. Competing, conflicting opinions from different areas of the university are thought to require a central authority with the final say.

Hierarchical administration involves faculty through appointed tasks forces or committees.The central administration looks at the recommendations, and determines what the future structure of the curriculum will be. Hierarchical administration may have the unfortunate consequence of uniting the faculty, often in opposition, since it excludes faculty from significant involvement. This approach is seductive to higher level administrators, since it seems to promise a quick and clean resolution to what is often a lengthy and nasty business.

Matrix administration (Scott, 1981; 220) retains many of the advantages of hierarchical administration and organizational unit democracy, while breaking down traditional loyalties within the institution, restructuring communication channels, and creating new priorities. With regard to curriculum, for example, a matrix administration approach to general education would establish new organizational structures that reach across the existing lines. Instead of curriculum committees within schools and departments, an interdiscplinary organization would be created. Levine (1978) and Gaff (1983) both maintain that one of the most effective ways to achieve major curriculum reform is to create a new school or college charged with just that responsibility. Since the upper administration controls personnel assignment, policy, and institutional priorities, initiative and final control over the insitution remain with the administration. Matrix administration produces an administrative structure that is conducive to change. Institutions which have had a rigid administrative history may do well to consider adapting a matrix model if creative and productive change is to occur. As long as upper

administration has the confidence of its outside authority, it retains control over the key processes within the institution.

Change characterizes higher education in America. While the liberal arts and sciences were the most important components of a university education earlier in this century, today the vocational, technical, and para-professional programs seem to be dominant. The initiative for change has shifted back and forth from university administrators, students, faculty, and outside forces. Faculty and departments took over from students in the 1970s, expanding their major curricula at the expense of general education and electives. Curriculum change in higher education, whether an expansion of the major or a reaffirmation of general education, must involve faculty, administration, and students. Faculty, in particular, have been the key agents for change and stability in the university curriculum.

## RESEARCH PROBLEM

In all administrative models discussed, the faculty play a critical role in general education curriculum determination; therefore, this research focuses primarily on faculty. Student opinion will be examined since students are the consumers of any general education program. The relationship between faculty opinion and the administrative context will be discussed later. We propose that faculty and departmental support for general education curriculum reform varies with the extent to which a department is vocationally and technically oriented. Faculty in the liberal arts and pure sciences are the most likely to be in favor of general education reform. Faculty in the traditional areas

may also perceive that student competencies are declining, since general requirements, as opposed to major requirements, have declined. The faculty in liberal arts and sciences may also be more likely than faculty in applied and technical areas to identify general education as significant. The faculty in the liberal arts and sciences are in those departments which have lost majors to the applied and technical areas of the university. The applied areas have both expanded their numbers of majors and the number of hours in their majors. We expect that the greatest opposition to general education curriculum reform will come from faculty in those departments.

This paper examines faculty and student opinion about general education at one university. While the results may not be generalizable, they do provide an in-depth look at attitudes about general education reform on one campus. Southwest Texas State University is a comprehensive university with an enrollment of just over 18,000 students. The university has been examining the possibility of change in its general education requirements. A task force had been established under an earlier administration to examine the present requirements and to make recommendations for change. The task force conducted a survey of faculty opinion on the present requirements and structure of general education. The faculty survey was a universe survey with a 50 percent response rate. Although not sponsored by the university, a survey of student opinion was also conducted. The student survey used a random sample technique. While 200 students were included in the sample, 66 returned their questionnaires, for a response rate of 33.3 percent. These data allow us to examine a number of questions regarding faculty and student

opinion on general education reform.

Hypothesis 1: Faculty in the liberal arts and sciences are more likely to support general education reform.

Hypothesis 2: Faculty in the liberal arts and sciences are less likely to see students as highly competent on a number of measures.

Hypothesis 3: Faculty in the liberal arts and sciences are more likely to value highly areas identified with general education.

Hypothesis 4: Students are less likely than liberal arts faculty to support general education reform.

Hypothesis 5: Students evaluate their competence more highly than do faculty.

Hypothesis 6: Students are less likely than faculty to value highly areas identified with general education.

## FINDINGS

A similar questionnaire was distributed to faculty and students to facilitate comparison between the two groups. Respondents were asked questions regarding their department or major and their class rank or university position. When asked if they were familiar with the existing general education requirements, 83.9 percent of the faculty and 71.2 percent of the students stated that they knew the requirements. Two measures of respondents' attitudes toward change in general education requirements were used. One question asked about the number of hours that should be required in a general education program. The other asked about the structure of the program. The majority of the faculty (57.2%) wanted the same number of hours; 26.8 percent wanted more hours. More and fewer hours at this institution are variable,

since the present general education requirements and the amount of them are variable depending upon the student's major department. Students felt differently than the faculty on the number of hours. Only 9.2 percent wanted more general education hours; 67.2 percent wanted less. While students and faculty are split on the number of hours in a general education package, they agree that they do not want the present

(Table 1 about here)

program. Both groups prefer a core curriculum with some degree of choice within it. Faculty and students overwhelmingly reject the structure of the present program; they appear to be supportive of reform, although they clearly differ on the number of hours to be required in a general education program. The null hypothesis for hypothesis four cannot be rejected.

Faculty vary in the type of reform they support according to their school affiliation. When respondents were asked to select whether they wanted fewer, the same, or more hours in general education, almost 60 percent of the faculty preferred the same number. There are, however, differences among faculty according to their school. As Table 2 shows, faculty in science and the liberal arts are more likely to support an

(Table 2 about here)

increase in the number of hours in general education, while applied faculty were significantly more likely to support either the same or fewer hours. This difference is significant at the .01 level using

analysis of variance. Further, an Eta of .39 suggests that a modest part of the variance is explained by school. The data support a rejection of the null hypothesis for hypothesis 1.

Another startling difference between faculty and students is their preferences with regard to practical courses in general education. The faculty overwhelmingly (67.1%) do not want more practical courses in general education, while 80.3 percent of the students want more practical courses in general education. Students prefer practicality even in their general education, while the majority of the faculty prefer courses which may not appear to have any practical application. One third of the faculty, however, agree with the students. The faculty that support more practical courses in general education are more likely to be in the applied and vocational schools, specifically applied arts, business, education, and health professions. (See Table 3). Although the small number of student respondents prohibits strict

(Table 3 about here)

comparison, students in the liberal arts, sciences, health professions, and education prefer more practical courses, while students in business, applied arts, and creative arts do not support more practical general education courses. The latter students may be receiving enough practical education in their major courses.

Faculty and students are supportive of reform in general education. Linked to their support for reform is a dissatisfaction with the current structure of general education. Faculty want to maintain the number of curriculum hours that are committed to general education,

while students would like to reduce that number. Faculty do not see a need for general education to be practical in nature; students believe that general education should be more practical than it is.

STUDENT COMPETENCE AND GENERAL EDUCATION

One problem, perhaps the problem with reform, is the content of reform. While the faculty in this institution are supportive of change in general education, they differ significantly as to the types of things that they see as problematic, as well as the types of changes that they favor. Faculty and students were asked to evaluate student competence in reading, writing, oral communication, thinking, familiarity with a broad body of knowledge, computer literacy, knowledge of different cultures, and mathematics skills. Faculty and students differ significantly on all items but three. On only one item, oral communication, do students see themselves as less competent than the faculty see them. Table 4 displays the different means for faculty and student perception of competence; the higher the mean score, the lower the perception of competence. The items in Table 4

(Table 4 about here)

represent many of the advanced learning skills that are associated with general education. The statistically significant difference in mean scores between student and faculty perceptions of student competence on five of eight items show that faculty have a much lower estimation of student competence than students do. The null hypothesis for hypothesis 5 is rejected.

There are also differences among the faculty regarding the

evaluation of student competence. On six of eight measures of faculty perception of student competence, faculty differ significantly according to their school affiliations. Table 5 shows that liberal arts faculty are more likely to see students as lacking in a

(Table 5 about here)

combination of basic skills and general knowledge. Liberal arts faculty are significantly different from their colleagues in their evaluation of student competence in reading, thinking, exposure to a broad body of knowledge, knowledge of other cultures, and math skills. Faculty from the more applied areas, in particular health professions, tend to be more satisfied with the competence levels of the students they teach. The technical and vocational areas of the university evaluate students' competencies higher than their liberal arts colleagues evaluate students. These differences are highlighted by the creation of a consolidated student competence scale. This scale combines all values of perceived student competence by the faculty.

(Table 6 about here)

Again, the higher the mean score achieved, the lower the perception of competence. As Table 6 shows, faculty in the applied areas are most likely to perceive their students as performing well on all measures of student competence; this difference is significant at the .01 level. The null hypothesis is rejected for hypothesis 2. Faculty in the more traditional areas of the university, who see a broader range of

students than those in the applied areas, are the most concerned about and have the least confidence in student competence. Traditional faculty also tend to be the most supportive of general education reform.

Using the consolidated student competence scale and testing for a difference of the means between faculty and student perceptions of competence, analysis of variance shows a .01 level of significant difference, as shown in Table 7. The difference in evaluating competence is explained by faculty and student ranks.

(Table 7 about here)

This relationship yields an Eta of .44. The composite scale and the significantly different means of faculty and students provides further support for hypothesis 5.

In sum, liberal arts and science faculty are moderately more likely (Eta=.3165) than technical and vocational faculty to believe that student competence needs improvement. Faculty as a whole are more likely (Eta=.44) than students to believe that student competence needs improvement.

IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL EDUCATION

Faculty and student respondents were asked to rank a number of items that are widely identified with general education. These are reading, writing, logical analysis, computer literacy, math skills, exposure to other cultures, integration of knowledge across disciplines, and introduction to disciplines. Table 8 shows that faculty and students differ significantly on math and logic as

(Table 8 about here)

areas of importance. In both instances, faculty value logical analysis and math more highly than do the student respondents. As with the assessment of student competence, a composite scale was created for the importance of general education areas. When faculty and student means are compared on this scale, there is a significant difference of means at the .05 level, allowing for a rejection of the null hypothesis on hypothesis 6. However, the strength of the relationship is weak. (Eta=.13). While faculty and students do have significantly different means on the composite score , the significant dimensions that they differ on are limited to math and logic. Overall, faculty and students indicated that the general education areas are important.

While the majority of faculty respondents believe that general education is important, liberal arts faculty have the highest mean score on tne composite index (significant at .05 level), allowing for a rejection of the null hypothesis on hypothesis 3. Liberal arts faculty are highest on only three out of eight measures; for another three of the remaining measures shown in Table 9, liberal arts faculty are among the strongest supporters of general education. The most

(Table 9 about here)

outstanding difference between liberal arts and other faculty is exposure to other cultures. With an Eta of .4552, liberal arts faculty show significant support for exposure to other cultures as an important

part of general education.

Not only is there disagreement between faculty and students on the significance of math and logic, the faculty disagree among themselves. Science, liberal arts, and business faculty value mathematics more highly than do the faculty in the creative arts, education, and health. The stereotype of the creative arts seems to be true, i.e. artists do not like math. It seems a bit discouraging that education and health profession faculty are not stronger in recognizing the importance of math in general education. Like math, logic is strongly supported by some faculty. Liberal arts and business faculty are more supportive. The least supportive, again, are creative arts and education faculty.

To briefly summarize the findings, while faculty and students support reform in general education, there are significant differences of opinion. Students want general education to be more practical; faculty do not. Faculty in the liberal arts and sciences tend to view student competence in a less favorable light than their colleagues in the applied and technical areas or students themselves. Liberal arts faculty value math and logic as areas of general education more so than the applied and technical faculty. We were able to reject the null hypothesis for all but hypothesis number four.

## DISCUSSION

Surveys of this type have a number of uses in the context of general education reform: 1) They assess opinion on general education among students and faculty. 2) Surveys enhance discussion in the university community about general education. 3) They provide a context within which actors in general education reform can make action

decisions. 4). When linked with an organizational model for action, the social scientist may begin to make some predictive assessments. It is the latter prospect that is of the greatest interest for this paper.

MATRIX ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION: AN EXAMPLE

A critical responsibility of any administration is to facilitate cooperation and reduce conflict among competing areas of the university. Particularly when there is reliable information, such as survey data, that different parts of the faculty feel quite differently from one another, the administration has a vital and delicate role to play. The critical areas of conflict, as shown by the survey data, are between the technical, vocational areas of the university and the traditional liberal arts and sciences. There is no easy resolution to this form of conflict. The liberal arts feel themselves threatened by the loss of majors and enrollment, and the technical areas feel that they are not receiving the kind of support that they need.

The matrix model of administration facilitates communication across different organizational structures of the university. Through controlled, open communication between departments and schools, a new university-wide set of goals can be evolved, including general education curriculum reform.

General education reform is on the university's agenda, under both the previous and present administrations. The previous administration, more hierarchical than the present matrix administration, appointed a task force to study general education and make recommendations. After two years the task force completed its report and made it public to the university. The present administration, highly committed to general education, created an Office of General Studies staffed by a Dean.

This office organized the General Studies Council, consisting of faculty representatives selected by each department. The Dean appointed a number of committees from the General Studies Council to make recommendations on curriculum, advising, teaching, and testing. The curriculum committee is reviewing the task force report and will make recommendations to the Dean and the Council. It is thought that departments and schools will review the final product. The ultimate authority for the structure and content of general education rests with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President.

Since each department is equally represented, irrespective of faculty size, service or major responsibilities, commitment to general education or other factors,the general education reforms will probably be significantly different from those expressed in the survey by liberal arts and science faculty. Recent decades have substantially changed the structure and function of American universities. The technical and vocational programs have increased their proportionate share of the curriculum. While general education is the whole university's responsibility, it is one that must be weighed carefully. General education hours impinge on the hours that students spend in pursuit of their major. A weakened major may be significantly undercut in today's competitive academic marketplace.

Matrix administration leaves authority for decision-making at the top. Higher administration may follow or revise faculty recommendations. Also, the opinions of higher administration, directly stated or not, receive a better reception than do those of faculty before committees on general education. In determining its course of influence and action, upper administration must consider a range of

factors: 1) its commitment to general education; 2) the strength of its major within and without the university; 3) its mission; 4) its external environment, such as the state, competing institutions, employers, and donors. The review of the survey data on faculty opinion and the matrix administration structure at this institution suggest that general education will play a limited role, one subordinate to the major.

## CONCLUSIONS

Curriculum reform is a process that is affected by a number of factors: faculty opinion, administrative structure, and national reform climate. General education is one of the directions for reform today. At Southwest Texas State University, faculty favor a change in the structure of general education but their support varies according to whether they are in an applied, vocational, or liberal arts department. Resolution of faculty differences is taking place within a matrix model of administration. Conflict resolution will be within the matrix structure and, ultimately, at
the upper administration level.

TABLE 1
FACULTY AND STUDENT PREFERENCES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION
IN PERCENT

| PREFERENCES | FACULTY N=278 | STUDENTS N=66 |
|---|---|---|
| MORE COURSES | 26.8 | 9.2 |
| FEWER COURSES | 16.0 | 67.7 |
| SAME NUMBER OF COURSES | 57.2 | 23.1 |
| CORE NO CHOICE | 25.0 | 3.0 |
| CORE WITH CHOICE | 55.9 | 63.6 |
| FEW REQUIRED | 12.1 | 21.2 |
| PROGRAM AS IS | 7.0 | 12.1 |
| MORE PRACTICAL GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES | 32.9 | 80.3 |
| NO PRACTICAL COURSES IN GENERAL EDUCATION | 67.1 | 19.7 |

TABLE 2
FACULTY PREFERENCES FOR NUMBER OF HOURS IN
GENERAL EDUCATION BY SCHOOL IN PERCENT

| SCHOOL | FEWER HOURS | SAME HOURS | MORE HOURS |
|---|---|---|---|
| LIBERAL ARTS | 7.8 | 44.2 | 48.1 |
| SCIENCES | 4.3 | 58.7 | 37.0 |
| EDUCATION | 26.1 | 56.5 | 17.4 |
| CREATIVE ARTS | 26.9 | 65.4 | 7.7 |
| BUSINESS | 7.7 | 84.6 | 5.0 |
| HEALTH PROF | 23.5 | 58.8 | 17.6 |

TABLE 3
SHOULD GENERAL EDUCATION BE MORE PRACTICAL?
FACULTY AND STUDENT RESPONSES BY SCHOOL

| | YES | | | | NO | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FACULTY | | STUDENTS | | FACULTY | | STUDENTS | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| APPLIED ARTS | 11 | 55.0 | 4 | 66.7 | 9 | 45.0 | 2 | 33.3 |
| EDUCATION | 22 | 47.8 | 10 | 90.9 | 24 | 52.2 | 1 | 9.1 |
| LIBERAL ARTS | 10 | 13.9 | 6 | 100.0 | 62 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SCIENCE | 6 | 15.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 34 | 85.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| BUSINESS | 11 | 47.8 | 15 | 68.2 | 12 | 52.2 | 7 | 31.8 |
| CREATIVE ART | 7 | 31.8 | 3 | 60.0 | 15 | 68.2 | 2 | 40.0 |
| HEALTH PROF | 10 | 58.8 | 3 | 100.0 | 7 | 41.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL | 77 | 32.1 | 44 | 78.6 | 163 | 67.9 | 12 | 21.4 |

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF FACULTY AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS
OF STUDENT COMPETENCE

| AREA OF STUDENT COMPETENCE | FACULTY MEAN | STUDENT MEAN |
|---|---|---|
| READING | 3.375 | 3.288 |
| WRITING* | 3.706 | 3.030 |
| ORAL COMMUNICATION | 3.187 | 3.349 |
| THINKING | 3.58 | 3.318 |
| BROAD BODY OF KNOWLEDGE* | 3.693 | 3.197 |
| COMPUTER LITERACY* | 3.928 | 2.662 |
| KNOWLEDGE OF DIFFERENT CULTURES* | 3.682 | 2.546 |
| MATH SKILLS* | 3.692 | 2.833 |

*SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL

TABLE 5
MEAN FACULTY PERCEPTION OF STUDENT COMPETENCE
BY SCHOOL

| SCHOOL | STUDENT COMPETENCE COMPOSITE* | READING* | WRITING** | THINKING** | BROAD BODY OF KNOWLED* | COMPUTER LITERACY* | KNOW OF DIFFER CULTURE* | MATH SKILLS** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LIB ARTS | 3.77 | 3.58 | 3.88 | 3.54 | 4.18 | 3.72 | 4.23 | 3.67 |
| SCIENCE | 3.61 | 3.50 | 3.88 | 3.51 | 3.68 | 3.72 | 3.41 | 3.87 |
| EDUC | 3.51 | 3.23 | 3.54 | 3.27 | 3.40 | 4.34 | 3.50 | 3.64 |
| CREAT ART | 3.37 | 3.20 | 3.56 | 3.16 | 3.52 | 4.10 | 3.57 | 3.28 |
| BUSINESS | 3.48 | 3.17 | 3.78 | 3.38 | 3.33 | 3.70 | 3.44 | 4.00 |
| APPLIED ART | 3.46 | 3.37 | 3.79 | 3.32 | 3.37 | 3.94 | 3.21 | 3.56 |
| HEALTH PROF | 3.33 | 3.18 | 3.50 | 2.94 | 3.45 | 3.60 | 3.47 | 3.69 |

*SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL
**SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL

TABLE 6
FACULTY PERCEPTION OF STUDENT COMPETENCE
COMPOSITE SCALE; RANK ORDERED BY SCHOOL

| RANK | SCHOOL | MEAN |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | LIBERAL ARTS | 3.77 |
| 2 | SCIENCE | 3.61 |
| 3 | EDUCATION | 3.51 |
| 4 | BUSINESS | 3.48 |
| 5 | APPLIED ARTS | 3.46 |
| 6 | CREATIVE ARTS | 3.34 |
| 7 | HEALTH PROF | 3.33 |

TABLE 7
COMPARISON OF FACULTY AND STUDENT MEANS ON STUDENT COMPETENCE AND IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL EDUCATION COMPOSITE SCALES

| GROUP | STUDENT COMPETENCE COMPOSITE MEAN* | IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL EDUCATION COMPOSITE** |
|---|---|---|
| FACULTY | 3.57 | 4.06 |
| STUDENTS | 2.99 | 3.92 |

*SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL.
**SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL.

TABLE 8
COMPARISON OF FACULTY AND STUDENT MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL EDUCATION AREAS

| GENERAL EDUCATION AREAS | FACULTY | STUDENTS |
|---|---|---|
| READING | 4.81 | 4.78 |
| WRITING | 4.87 | 4.75 |
| LOGICAL ANALYSIS* | 4.05 | 3.70 |
| COMPUTER LITERACY | 3.55 | 3.70 |
| MATHEMATICS* | 4.02 | 3.57 |
| EXPOSURE TO OTHER CULTURES | 3.64 | 3.36 |
| INTEGRATION ACROSS DISCIPLINES | 3.82 | 3.65 |
| INTRODUCTION TO DISCIPLINES | 3.77 | 3.65 |

*SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL.

TABLE 9
FACULTY MEAN PERCEPTION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL EDUCATION AREAS BY SCHOOL

| SCHOOL | COMPOSITE SCORE* | READ ING | WRIT ING | LOGIC ANAL** | COMPUTER LITER | MATH ** | OTHER CULTUR* | INTER DISCPL* | INTRO DISCPL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LIB ART | 4.19 | 4.85 | 4.87 | 4.36 | 3.42 | 4.29 | 4.24 | 3.78 | 3.69 |
| SCIENCE | 3.98 | 4.92 | 4.94 | 3.94 | 3.31 | 4.31 | 3.04 | 3.46 | 3.93 |
| EDUC | 4.03 | 4.65 | 4.80 | 3.78 | 3.69 | 3.62 | 3.67 | 4.07 | 3.87 |
| CREA ART | 4.03 | 4.73 | 4.68 | 3.75 | 3.55 | 3.45 | 4.09 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| BUSINESS | 4.05 | 4.69 | 4.77 | 4.31 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 3.12 | 3.81 | 3.58 |
| APPL ART | 4.07 | 4.90 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.42 | 3.80 | 3.60 |
| HEALTH | 3.91 | 4.94 | 4.94 | 3.94 | 3.59 | 3.65 | 3.00 | 3.71 | 3.53 |
| ETA | .226 | ---- | ---- | .296 | ---- | .335 | .452 | .253 | ---- |

*SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL.
**SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL.

FIGURE 1

TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS
AND GENERAL EDUCATION
REFORM

| STRUCTURES | FACULTY DEMOCRACY | ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT DEMOCRACY | HIERARCHICAL ADMINISTRATION | MATRIX ADMINISTRATION |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PROCESS | FACULTY MEETINGS: REFERENDUMS | FACULTY MEETING REPORT UP LINE OF AUTHORITY | COMMITTEE APPTED RECOMMENDATION; OUTCOME DECIDED BY ADMINISTRATOR | NEW STRUCTURE ACROSS LINES; MULTIPLE REVIEW; RECOMMEND TO ADMINISTRATION |
| OUTCOME | FACULTY VOTE: SINGLE OUTCOME | MULTIPLE RECOMMENDATIONS; ADVISORY ROLE; CONFLICT ACROSS LINES | SINGLE OUTCOME; MULTIPLE SOURCES OF RESISTANCE | COMMUNICATION ACROSS LINES BREAKS UNIT BOUNDARIES; CREATES NEW PRIORITIES AND LOYALTIES |

## REFERENCES


Beck, R.E. (1981) Career Patterns: The Liberal Arts Major in Bell System Managment, Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Carnegie Council (1980) The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education: A Summary of Reports and Recommendations, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Chambers, R.H. (1981) "Educating for Perspective - A Proposal" Change, 13:45-51.

Gaff, Jerry (1981) "Reconstructing General Education: Lessons from Project GEM" Change, 13:52-58.

Gaff, Jerry and Michael Davis (1981) "Student Views of General Education," Liberal Education, Summer: 112-123.

Gaff, Jerry (1983) General Education Today, San Francisco: Jossy Bass.

Hall, Lawrence S. (1183) "Liberal Education: Neither Liberal nor an Education," Change, May: 9-11.

Hansen, D.W. (1982) "New Directions in General Education," JGE: The Journal of General Education, 33:247-262.

Kerr, Clark (1982) "'The Uses of the University' Two Decades Later: Postscript 1982," Change, October: 24-31.

Levine, Arthur (1978) Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Scott, W. Richard (1981) Organizations: Rational, National, and Open Systems, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Toffler, Alvin (1981) The Third Wave, New York: Bantam.

Watts, W. David and Roland Johnson (1984) "Employment of Sociology Graduates, 1982," Teaching Sociology, 11: 183-204.